DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 558 EC 210 327

AUTHOR Bauman, Phoebe Lee
TITLE Expectations of Educational Programming and Parent-School Relations: A Comparison of Parents of Gifted and Talented Learning Disabled Children and Parents of Other Gifted and Talented Children.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (66th, Washington, DC, March 28-April 1, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Advocacy; *Educational Practices; *Expectation; *Gifted; Group Unity; Individual Differences; *Learning Disabilities; Opinions; Parent Associations; *Parent Attitudes; Parent School Relationship; *Talent

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine if parents of gifted and talented learning-disabled children differed from parents of other gifted/talented children in their expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations. Subjects included 265 parents who were members of The Gifted and Talented Association of Montgomery County (Maryland) or Parents of Gifted/Learning Disabled Children. Nine components of educational programming were studied: goals and objectives, identification procedures, instruction, counseling, staff selection and training, parent-school communication, parent education, parent involvement, and evaluation. Through reviews of records, observations, interviews, and questionnaires, it was found that the two groups did have different expectations. Parents of gifted/talented learning-disabled children were significantly stronger in some of their expectations and more in agreement with each other than parents of other gifted/talented children. Educational implications are outlined, including: schools should give priority consideration to those issues with strongest parental expectations; parents' expectations should be systematically solicited by the school system; parent advocacy groups should maintain accurate assessments of their members' expectations; and advocacy groups should compare their expectations with those of other groups and form coalitions. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED296558

Expectations of Educational Programming and Parent-School Relations: A Comparison of Parents of Gifted and Talented Learning Disabled Children and Parents of Other Gifted and Talented Children

by

Phoebe Lee Bauman, Ph.D.

Educational planning must respond positively to the concerns and pressures of society, but in order to do so it must consider the underlying expectations of the groups involved (Kaufman & English, 1979). Programming that meets the expectations of professional educators but not those of other groups involved in education is bound to generate dissatisfaction and conflict. Parents, one of the key groups in the education environment, must have their expectations met if they are to be a source of support for educational programming (French & Murphy, 1983). Indeed, educational programming that fails to meet parents' expectations will, at best, not be supported by parents and is vulnerable to attack in both the education and political arenas. Hence, educational planning should include provisions for determining parents' expectations. Knowledge of parents' expectations, furthermore, permits educational planning to identify areas where professional expectations differ from those of parents and where expectations of different parent groups differ from one another. With this kind of information, programming can be designed to address a wide range of expectations. Educational programming that

EC 210 387

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Phoebe Lee Bauman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

successfully meets parents' expectations will increase parental satisfaction, obtain political support, and serve as an effective vehicle for change (Zaltman, Florio, & Sikorski, 1977).

A great deal of accurate information on parents' expectations can be obtained through the use of surveys. This information can be used to plan new educational programming to meet parents' expectations, and to support or strengthen existing programming that already meets those expectations. In addition, conducting surveys conveys the educational organization's sensitivity and receptiveness to parents and their expectations (Kerlinger, 1973; Ebel, 1980).

Purpose of the Study

A review of the literature indicated that there has been some research on the expectations of parents of gifted and talented children regarding the components of educational programming and parent-school relations (Gallagher, Weiss, Oglesby, & Thomas, 1985). One study was found that compared the characteristics and needs of parents of gifted and talented children, parents of normal children, and parents of learning disabled children (Grenard-Moore, 1985). No research was found on what parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children expect of the components of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children.

The purpose of this study was to fill part of the gap in knowledge of what parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children and parents of other gifted and talented children expect of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding their children.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigated parents' expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations. It sought to determine if parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children differ from parents of other gifted and talented children in their expectations of the following nine components of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children: "Goals and objectives;" "identification procedures;" "instruction;" "counseling;" "staff selection and training;" "parent-school communication;" "parent education;" "parent involvement;" and "evaluation." The study used both qualitative and quantitative research methods to obtain data to 1) assess expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children on the part of two groups-- parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children and parents of other gifted and talented children; 2) compare the two groups' expectations; and 3) analyze any differences.

Populations

The study was conducted in Montgomery County, Maryland, a suburb of Washington, D. C. comprising 495 square miles and having a population of 604,000 in 1984 (Montgomery County Planning Board, 1986). The county ranked fourth in the nation in level of education according to the 1980 Census of Population (United States Bureau of the Census, 1981), and third in the nation in per capita income, according to a 1983 study of affluent areas by the United States Department of Commerce. Its school age population was 107,583 in 1984 (Montgomery County Planning Board, 1986).

The two populations included in this study were the total parent membership of two advocacy groups for gifted and talented children in Montgomery County--The Gifted and Talented Association of Montgomery County and Parents of Gifted/Learning Disabled Children.

Research Design

Data used in the investigation were obtained using five research methods: Review of records and documents; participant observations; open-ended interviews with a panel of experts; a structured survey questionnaire; and a semi-structured interview.

The review of records and documents included research reports and projects; official publications relating to Montgomery County and its school system; publications of The Gifted and Talented Association of Montgomery County; and publications of Parents of Gifted/Learning Disabled Children. Participant observations included observations of meetings held by The Gifted and Talented Association of Montgomery County and Parents of Gifted/Learning Disabled Children.

Information gathered through the review of records and documents and participant observations was used to identify the components and related key issues of educational programming and parent-school relations and parent concerns and interests regarding gifted and talented learning disabled children and other gifted and talented children. The components, issues, concerns, and interests were used to formulate the items to be included in the survey questionnaire and semistructured interviews.

Open-ended interviews were held with a panel of experts in the education of gifted and talented learning disabled children to obtain information on research on educational programming and existing educational programming for the gifted and talented learning disabled and to validate the study and the survey and interview questionnaire. Based on the comments made by the experts, the survey and interview questionnaire were revised, some items were added, some were deleted, and others were clarified.

The structured survey questionnaire was designed to measure parents' expectations of each of nine components of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children. The survey questionnaire consisted of forty-five statements (items) relating to the nine components (see Appendix A and B). The respondent was asked to express a degree of disagreement or agreement with each statement using a Likert scale of five positions--SD) strongly disagree; D) disagree; U) undecided; A) agree; SA) strongly agree. The survey questionnaire also requested information on whether the parent had a child who was identified as gifted and talented or learning disabled and other demographic information on the respondent and child.

The survey questionnaire was administered to a pilot population. The pilot was to determine the reliability of the total instrument, the components, and the individual items and to determine any weaknesses in format or instructions. The Pearson correlation coefficient of each item with the total questionnaire was computed, as was the Alpha reliability coefficient of each component and the total questionnaire. The results provided evidence of the internal reliability of the total instrument, the component, and the individual items. No problem was found with the format of the survey questionnaire, the instructions, or the procedures followed.

After the pilot, the survey questionnaire was administered by mail to the two populations. Each survey questionnaire returned was examined to assure that the respondent had a child who was identified as gifted and talented or gifted and talented learning disabled. If the respondent did not report having such a child in the demographics section of the questionnaire, the survey questionnaire was discarded. Other demographic information was collected at the request of the two groups and was not used in this study.

The number and percent of each population responding to the survey questionnaire are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Response to Survey Questionnaire

Population	Questionnaire		
	Number N	Returned N / %	Usable* N / %
Parents of Gifted and Talented Learning Disabled Children	135	98 / 73	87 / 64
Parents of Other Gifted and Talented Children	288	203 / 70	178 / 62
Total Number	423	301 / 71	265 / 63

* The difference between the number returned and the number usable is accounted for by 34 questionnaires from parents who did not indicate that they had a child who was gifted and talented or gifted and talented learning disabled in grades K-12, and 2 questionnaires which were not completed.

For each item, the numeric and percent distributions along the Likert scale were compiled and the mean score and standard deviation were computed for each group of parents. The total mean and standard deviation were computed for each item, component, and the total survey questionnaire, for each group of parents. The t value of the differences between the groups was determined. A difference between the two groups was considered to exist for an item, a component, and the total questionnaire if the difference was significant at the 95-percent level of confidence.

Semistructured interviews based on the survey questionnaire were administered to a subset of each of the two population to increase the reliability and the validity of the results of the study and to provide insight into the findings of the survey questionnaire and allow the researcher to follow up on unexpected results.

Information obtained from the review of records and documents, participant observations, open-ended interviews with a panel of experts, piloting the survey questionnaire, final administration of the survey questionnaire, and the semistructured interview was summarized and analyzed.

Summary of Findings

Findings from the survey questionnaire, the semistructured interview, and the review of records and documents indicated that parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children differed from parents of other gifted and talented children in their expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children.

The results of the survey questionnaire revealed that, for the forty-five items as a group, parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children were significantly stronger in their expectations and more in agreement with each other than parents of other gifted and talented children (see table 2). The results from the semistructured interview and the review of records and documents supported these findings (Bauman, 1987).

Table 2

Results of *t* Test For Total Survey Questionnaire

Mean		Standard Deviation		*t* Value
GTLD	GT	GTLD	GT	
79.4598	91.3174	13.207	15.980	-5.94*

Key:
GTLD = Parents of Gifted Learning Disabled.Total Number = 87
GT = Parents of Other Gifted and Talented.Total Number =178
* = Significant difference at 95% level of confidence

For each of the nine components of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children (goals and objectives; identification procedures; instruction; counseling; staff selection and training; parent communication; parent education; parent involvement; and evaluation) parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children were significantly stronger in their expectations and more in agreement with each other than were parents of other gifted and talented children (see table 3). The results from the semistructured interview and the review of records and documents supported these findings (Bauman, 1987).

Table 3

Results of t Test For Each Component of Survey Questionnaire

Component	Mean		Standard Deviation		t Value
	GTLD	GT	GTLD	GT	
Goals and Objectives	9.8313	11.3216	2.603	2.861	-3.96*
Identification Procedures	9.6395	10.7931	2.366	2.590	-3.49*
Instruction	10.5181	12.4140	2.302	2.323	-6.03*
Counseling	9.4186	10.6437	2.888	3.563	-2.65*
Staff Selection and Training	6.9881	9.0617	2.142	2.709	-6.09*
Parent-School Communication	7.8214	8.6149	2.174	2.247	-2.65*
Parent Education	5.6782	6.5644	1.715	1.757	-3.83*
Parent Involvement	11.4512	13.1296	3.604	3.063	-3.81*
Evaluation	8.5765	10.0736	2.206	2.273	-4.97*

Key:
GTLD=Parents of Gifted and Talented Learning Disabled.Total Number= 87
GT = Parents of Other Gifted and Talented.....Total Number=178
* = Significant difference at 95% level of confidence

Parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children did not, however, have significantly stronger expectations than parents of other gifted and talented children regarding all of the 45 items related to the components. For 14 of the items on the survey questionnaire, the groups did not differ significantly in their expectations, and for one item parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children had a significantly weaker expectation than parents of other gifted and talented children (see Table 4). Findings from the semistructured interview showed that the groups were similar in expectations for 25 of the 45 items. However, the responses to questions asked by the researcher revealed that the groups had different reasons for agreement. (Bauman, 1987).

Table 4

Results of t Test for Each Item in Survey Questionnaire

Item	Mean		Standard Deviation		t Value
	GTLD	GT	GTLD	GT	
1	1.6628	1.7212	0.876	0.860	-0.51
2	1.7857	2.0123	0.729	0.997	-1.84
3	1.3218	1.4518	0.581	0.578	-1.70
4	1.5581	1.8072	0.835	0.838	-2.24*
5	1.5233	1.8614	0.836	0.866	-2.97*
6	2.0233	2.4217	1.095	1.097	-2.74*
7	1.2529	1.3313	0.463	0.509	-1.20
8	1.3333	1.8434	0.787	0.940	-4.32*
9	1.4368	1.8133	0.758	0.905	-3.32*
10	2.5977	1.9699	1.333	0.849	4.56*
11	2.6163	2.8293	0.972	0.995	-1.62
12	1.6552	2.3795	0.986	0.988	-5.54*
13	1.5402	2.0000	0.860	1.076	-3.45*
14	1.1379	1.9818	0.408	0.785	-9.38*
15	2.3412	2.6871	0.970	0.926	-2.75*
16	2.0353	2.0915	0.808	0.863	-0.49
17	2.2759	2.3795	0.936	0.951	-0.83
18	1.7356	1.9573	0.619	0.738	-2.39*
19	1.7791	2.0122	0.658	0.836	-2.25*
20	1.8488	2.1159	0.642	0.861	-2.53*
21	1.8161	2.2256	0.740	0.993	-3.38*
22	2.3563	2.7073	1.201	1.177	-2.23*
23	1.4651	1.8293	0.663	0.911	-3.28*
24	1.6429	2.0366	0.755	0.959	-3.28*
25	1.5930	2.5061	0.757	1.042	-7.19*
26	2.5233	3.0549	0.942	1.035	-3.98*
27	1.9770	2.0000	0.807	0.806	-0.21
28	2.3678	2.8537	1.036	1.035	-3.54*
29	1.6744	2.1718	0.641	0.798	-4.99*
30	1.3678	1.5671	0.055	0.521	-2.91*
31	1.5402	1.7239	0.696	0.811	-1.79
32	1.8506	2.0429	0.959	0.884	-1.59
33	1.5833	1.8395	0.732	0.747	-2.57*
34	1.5287	1.4606	0.500	0.644	0.93
35	1.5747	1.6606	0.709	0.694	-0.93
36	1.3678	1.5818	0.485	0.542	-3.09*
37	1.3103	1.8303	0.556	0.631	-6.47*
38	1.4253	1.5092	0.520	0.651	-1.04
39	1.7791	2.3795	0.999	1.219	-3.93*
40	1.8161	2.0727	0.883	0.823	-2.29*
41	1.5747	1.7091	0.709	0.707	-1.43
42	2.7558	3.1091	1.292	1.307	-2.04*
43	1.6118	1.9277	0.692	0.767	-3.19*
44	1.9070	1.9632	0.713	0.702	-0.60
45	2.2326	2.3025	0.850	0.835	-0.62

Key:
GTLD = Parents of Gifted Learning Disabled.Total Number = 87
GT = Parents of Other Gifted and Talented.Total Number =178
* = Significant difference at 95% level of confidence

Limitations of the Study

This study used non-randly selected populations in a large, diverse, suburban county. The members of the populations are parents of gifted and talented children and belong to one of two advocacy groups concerned with the education of gifted and talented children. One group focuses on gifted and talented children who are learning disabled; the other is concerned with gifted and talented children in general. Thus, the members of the populations have already expressed a commitment to educational programming for gifted and talented children.

The vast majority are white, middle class, and college educated. Therefore, the populations studied are not necessarily representative of the universe of parents of gifted and talented children and/or parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children. Thus, it may not be possible to generalize the results of the study to all parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children and other gifted and talented children. However, it is widely accepted that the greatest educational change and progress come about through the efforts of advocacy groups rather than individual parents (Kappelman & Ackerman, 1977). Consequently, the expectations that members of the group have are likely to be at least as important as those of the entire universe of parents of gifted and talented children in the county in which the study was conducted.

Although the results of this investigation may not be applicable to the entire populations of parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children and parents of other gifted and talented children, the study was designed to be replicated with other populations and thus its findings may be validated.

The study relied on the voluntary participation of the members of the two populations. Hence, the possibility of errors of non-response exists. There is no way of knowing whether the expectations of nonrespondents differed from those of respondents. However, every effort was made to achieve a high response rate in order to minimize error of nonresponse.

The survey questionnaire was extensive rather than intensive, providing a great deal of information from large populations but not exploring that information in depth. However, follow-up interviews were conducted with a small sample of each population in order to obtain greater insight into the reasons behind the expectations reported.

Implications

Gifted and talented children are a diverse population whose specific characteristics and needs must be addressed through specific educational programming. Professional educators have recognized the importance of developing such educational programming. The values of society with regard

to gifted and talented children have been strongly influenced by increasing advocacy activities of parents concerned with the education of these children.

This study focuses on these parents and their expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding their children. The results of the study have implications for educational programming for gifted and talented children and relations between parents and the school. Seven implications are of particular importance.

Implication #1. The components of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented learning disabled children must differ in many aspects from those regarding other gifted and talented children. This implication derives from this study's findings that parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children differed from parents of other gifted and talented children in their expectations of each of the components and many of the related issues of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding their children. If differences are not addressed, educational programming will not be responding to these children's educational needs nor be meeting the expectations of their parents regarding educational programming and parent-school relations.

Implication #2. Educational planning should give priority consideration to those issues for which parents' expectations are the strongest, especially in these times of limited resources. Scarce resources should be concentrated on addressing those issues that will have the most favorable consequences for the quality of programming, rather than be spread over a number of areas in quantities insufficient to treat any of them well. This study has found that parents consider some issues relating to educational programming and parent-school relations to be more important than others. Failure to adequately address the more important issues perceived by parents will lead to dissatisfaction on the part of parents and lose of their support.

Implication #3. Parents and the school, working together, should establish mutually satisfactory guidelines for parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented learning disabled children and other gifted and talented children with special emphasis on parent communication, parent education, and parent involvement. The findings from this study indicate that parents' expectations for specific issues related to parent-school communication, and parent education and parent involvement, were as high as they were for specific issues related to the components of educational programming. Failure to address issues of parent-school relations substantially diminishes the parent-school partnership concept, limits the support parents are willing

to give the school, and may create an environment of distrust on the part of parents.

Implication #4. Parents' expectations should be recognized and systematically solicited by the school system. Parent membership on advisory groups, frequent open forums between parents and professionals, regular panel discussions, and timely parent surveys are among the ways this can be done. Solicitation of parent input would be viewed as an expression of the school system's desire to be responsive to parents. Moreover, when parent input is addressed, parent support for programming and resources will likely result. In addition, the consistency that this study found between parents' expectations and experts' recommendations (Bauman, 1987) implies that parents are in fact knowledgeable about their children's educational needs and thus would make valuable partners in educational programming. If this is not done, the school system is handicapped in knowing what issues are important for parents and is limiting its ability to be responsive to them. This may contribute to dissatisfaction, or even hostility, on the part of parents.

The results of this study also have important implications for both parent advocacy groups.

Implication #5. The two groups should systematically strive to maintain an accurate assessment of their members' expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children and gifted

and talented learning disabled children in order to enable the leadership to appropriately represent the membership and maintain the cohesiveness of the group. Groups that meet members' needs obviously encourage a strong and active base of support, which will increase their effectiveness and attract new members. On the other hand, groups that do not address the issues that are important to their members will likely experience a loss of membership, a weakening of their influence, and a lessening of their effectiveness.

Implication #6. The two groups should know how their expectations compare with those of other groups interested in general elementary and secondary education and form coalitions to promote areas of mutual interests. By joining together to address issues, they are more likely to have their common goals realized.

Implication #7. The groups should be familiar with the school system and its operations. The groups should be aware of current and planned educational programming and how it fits with each of the groups' expectations. They should work with the school to advance issues on which there is shared expectations, demonstrating how meeting each group's expectations can be beneficial to the school system, thereby establishing a basis for cooperative planning and possibly opening the door to dealing with issues on which the groups and the school system do not agree. The building of positive relations will create a cooperative environment.

Failure to do so results in frustration and lack of support for the school.

Recommendations for Further Study

As a result of this study, two major recommendations for further research would appear to be useful.

Recommendation #1. The study should be replicated to increase the validity of its findings using other populations of parents of gifted and talented children. Populations based on the characteristics of parents of gifted and talented children that might be studied include parents who are not members of advocacy groups and parents in different racial, ethnic, and socio-economic groups; and parents categorized by the nature or degree of the child's giftedness or learning disability, by whether the child is receiving educational programming for the gifted and talented or for the learning disabled, by the child's grade level, the child's sex, or by whether the child attends public or private school. Parents' expectations may be affected by these different variables.

Recommendation #2 A second line of useful inquiry would be to replicate this study to determine teachers' and administrators' expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children and gifted and talented learning disabled children. Professionals make an important contribution to the

development and maintenance of educational programming. Their expectations undoubtedly influence the nature of their decisions. It is therefore important for groups interested in educational planning to know what those expectations are so that they may be assessed and responded to in a manner that will assure the establishment and maintenance of optimum educational programming for all gifted and talented children and the establishment of positive parent-school relations.

References

Bauman, P.L. Expectations of Educational Programming and Parent-School Relations: A comparison of parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children and parents of other gifted and talented children (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1937A.

Ebel, R. L. Survey research in education: The need and the value. Peabody Journal of Education, 57(2), pp. 126-134.

French, J. L., & Murphy, J. P. Parenting of gifted children: A two-edged sword. Roeper Review, 1983, 5(3), pp. 27-36.

Gallagher, J. J., Weiss, P., Oglesby, K., & Thomas, T. The status of gifted/talented education: United States surveys of needs, practices, and policies. Los Angeles: The National/ State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and the Talented, 1983.

Grenard-Moore, S. J. A comparison of characteristics and needs of families having normal, disabled or gifted children (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 3072A.

Kappelman, M. Between parent and school. New York: The Dial Press/James Wade, 1977.

Kaufman, R. K., & English, F. W. Needs assessment. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Educational Technology Publications, Inc., 1979.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc. 1973.

Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission. 1984 census update survey, planning area profiles. Silver Spring, Md.: Author, 1986a.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1980 decennial census of population and housing. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

United States Department of Commerce. Study of affluent areas. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Zaltman, G., Florio, D. H., & Sikorski, L. Dynamic educational change. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Appendix

Appendix A

Survey Questionnaire Statements (Items)

1. The primary emphasis of educational programming for the gifted and talented child should be the recognition and development of individual gifts and talents.

2. Educational programming for the gifted and talented child should not provide for individual selection of topics to study or investigate.

3. The development of self understanding and self acceptance should be an essential part of educational programming for the gifted and talented child.

4. The gifted and talented child who has learning disabilities should not receive educational programming for the gifted and talented.

5. The development of social skills should be an essential part of educational programming for the gifted and talented child.

6. An individual educational plan should be developed for each gifted and talented child.

7. Parents should not be involved in the procedure used to determine if their child is gifted and talented.

8. Scores on intelligence tests and achievement tests should be the only criteria used to identify the gifted and talented child.

9. Procedures used to identify the gifted and talented child should be clearly stated and uniformly implemented.

10. Identification of the gifted and talented child should involve the school psychologist.

11. The criteria used to identify the gifted and talented child should not exclude the child who is achieving below grade level.

12. Special instruction in study skills should not be part of educational programming for the gifted and talented child.

13. Technological aids such as typewriters, computers, or tape recorders, need not be used by the child receiving educational programming for the gifted and talented.

14. Educational programming for the gifted and talented child should provide accommodations for the gifted and talented child with learning disabilities.

15. The daily progress of the gifted and talented child should be the responsibility only of each professional providing instruction.

16. The gifted and talented child benefits more from group instruction than from individual instruction.

17. Teachers who are qualified to teach the subject matter but who do not have training in the characteristics and needs of the gifted and talented should not teach the gifted and talented child.

18. Ability to use a variety of teaching methods to meet the needs of individual children is as important as knowledge of the subject matter for teachers of the gifted and talented.

19. When teachers of the gifted and talented are selected, their personal characteristics should be given as much consideration as their professional ability.

20. All professionals in the school should have training in the characteristics and needs of the gifted and talented child with learning disabilities.

21. Group and individual counseling services should be provided for each gifted and talented child.

22. Counseling services should be available for parents to help them understand and cope with their gifted and talented child's educational strengths and limitations.

23. Counseling services should be provided to help parents set realistic goals for their gifted and talented child.

24. The gifted and talented child should be given counseling to deal with educational strengths and limitations.

25. The gifted and talented child should receive counseling to help develop a positive self image.

26. Narrative comments, rather than letter or numerical grades, should be used to evaluate progress of the child receiving educational programming for the gifted and talented.

27. Daily self evaluation should be an essential part of educational programming for the gifted and talented child.

28. Procedures used to evaluate the progress of the gifted and talented child should be clearly stated and uniformly implemented.

29. Educational programming for the gifted and talented should be evaluated on the basis of how appropriate it is for each gifted and talented child.

30. Parents need not be involved in evaluating educational programming for their gifted and talented child.

31. Parents of gifted and talented children should have the opportunity to meet with all professionals providing educational programming for their child.

32. Parent conferences to discuss educational programming for their gifted and talented child should be held at the beginning of each school semester.

33. Parents need not share information with the school about their child's educational limitations.

34. Parents should participate in planning the educational programming for their gifted and talented child.

35. The school need provide parents only with information about educational programming the school considers appropriate for their gifted and talented child.

36. Only the school is responsible for making decisions about educational programming for the gifted and talented child.

37. The school should provide parents with information about educational policies and procedures regarding educational programming for the gifted and talented.

38. It should not be necessary for parents to provide out of school assistance for their gifted and talented child.

39. Parents of gifted and talented children should participate in support groups that promote educational provisions for gifted and talented children.

40. The school need not provide parents with information on the characteristics and needs of the gifted and talented child.

41. Meetings and conferences involving parents, teachers, and other professionals should be considered an essential part of educational programming for the gifted and talented.

42. The school should provide parents with information on the characteristics and needs of gifted and talented children with learning problems.

43. The school should provide parents with information on strategies that can be used to nurture and encourage their child's gifts and talents.

44. There should be continuity in educational programming for the gifted and talented child through the grades.

45. The community should be involved with the school in educational programming for the gifted and talented.

Appendix B

Survey Questionnaire Structure

	Component	Items
1.	Goals and Objectives	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
2.	Identification Procedures	8, 9, 10, 11, 12
3.	Instruction	7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 45
4.	Counseling	17, 18, 19, 20, 21
5.	Staff Selection and Training	22, 23, 24, 25
6.	Parent-School Communication	30, 31, 32, 33, 34
7.	Parent Education	35, 36, 37, 38
8.	Parent Involvement	39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44
9.	Evaluation	26, 27, 28, 29,

Scoring

Reverse scoring - 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 32, 33, 35, 39, 41, 43

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the
Council for Exceptional Children
(66th, Washington, DC, March 28-April 1, 1988)

ABSTRACT

Paper: Expectations of Educational Programming and Parent-School Relations: A Comparison of Parents of Gifted and Talented Learning Disabled Children and Parents of Other Gifted and Talented Children

Author: Phoebe Lee Bauman, Ph.D.

This study sought to determine if parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children differ from parents of other gifted and talented children in their expectations of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children.

The populations studied were parents who are members of one of two advocacy groups. One group's focus is on gifted and talented children who are learning disabled; the other is on gifted and talented children in general. Data used in the investigation were obtained using qualitative and quantitative methods. These were a review of records and documents, participant observations, open-ended interviews with a panel of experts, a structured survey questionnaire, and semistructured interviews.

The study found that parents of gifted and talented learning disabled children differed from parents of other gifted and talented children in their expectation of educational programming and parent-school relations regarding gifted and talented children. The implications of the findings for the planning of educational programming and the establishment of positive parent-school relations are presented with reference to both schools and parent groups. In addition, the researcher makes recommendations for further relevant research.